



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,515	12/06/1999	MAGNUS M. LONNROTH	50277-312(OI	3831

29989 7590 01/10/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

16

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/454,515

Applicant(s)

LONNROTH ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amendment B, received on 11/01/02, has been entered. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-11, 14-19, 21-23, 25, 27-30, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellwood et al. (Bellwood), U.S. Patent No. 6,401,132 and further in view of Dahm et al. (Dahm), U.S. Patent No. 6,301,471.

4. As to claim 1, Bellwood discloses the invention as claimed, a method for retrieving information from one or more data sources, the method including the steps of:

receiving, from a particular type of client, a request for a service (col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 16);

wherein said request for said service is received at a system located separately from said client (col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 34 and Fig. 2: a client request from a client machine 10 is received at a transcoding framework 20 (a system) that includes one or more transcoders may be used to facilitate data exchange);

wherein said request is sent by a particular user (col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 16);

within said system generating, based on a first set of parameters, a request object (col. 4, lines 34-60: in the system 22, the transcoder 22 then expresses the request in HTTP request (request object), e.g., encoding the desired data format into HTTP headers using and HTTP extension mechanism);

wherein said first set of parameters includes identity of said service (col. 4, lines 34-60);

based on said request object, said system transmitting requests to one or more data sources (col. 4, lines 34-60);

at said system receiving responses to the requests from the one or more data sources in one or more formats other than a particular format (col. 4, lines 34-60);

at said system converting the responses into said particular format; at said system generating, based on the responses, a composite response document in said particular format (col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13);

at said system transforming the composite response document into a client-formatted response (col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13);

and transmitting the client-formatted response to the particular user (col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13);

However, Bellwood does not disclose the second set of parameters includes identity of the particular type of client. In the same field of endeavor, Dahm discloses when a request is made from mobile device 250 to retrieve specification information in a server or landnet, the request comprises at least one URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) and a device ID or subscriber ID (col. 7, line 38 – col. 8, line 54, col. 10, lines 30-58, Fig. 2 and 4). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of parameters includes identity of the particular type of client as taught by Dahm into the system for transcoding an input stream to a desired output format using a transcoder framework of Bellwood, thereby resulting in the claimed invention, since Dahm suggests that including a device ID with URI for authentication.

5. As to claim 4, Bellwood-Dahm disclose generating the request object includes identity of the particular user (Dahm, col. 7, line 38 – col. 8, line 54, col. 10, lines 30-58, Fig. 2 and 4).

6. As to claim 6, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the step of receiving responses to the requests from the one or more data sources in one or more formats other than a particular involves receiving responses to the requests from the one or more data sources in one or more formats other than XML (Dahm, col. 5, lines 22-52);

the step of converting said responses into the particular format involves converting responses into XML (Bellwood, col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13);

Art Unit: 2142

the step of generating a composite response document in the particular format involves generating a composite response document in XML (Bellwood, col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13);

and the step of transforming the composite response document into a client-formatted response involves transforming the composite response document into a format other than XML (Bellwood, col. 4, line 17 – col. 5, line 13).

7. As to claim 8, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the one or more data sources include a first data source that supports a first protocol and is accessible through a first gateway, and a second data source that supports a second protocol and is accessible through a second gateway (Bellwood, col. 2, lines 35-42; col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 60);

and the step of converting the responses into the particular format includes the first gateway converting a response from the first data source to the particular format; and the second gateway converting a response from the second data source to the particular format (Bellwood, col. 2, lines 35-42; col. 3, line 57 – col. 5, line 13).

8. As to claim 9, Bellwood-Dahm disclose at least one of the first data source and the second data source is a database system (Bellwood, col. 4, line 61 – col. 5, line 13).

9. As to claim 10, Bellwood-Dahm disclose at least one of the first data source and the second data source is an HTTP server (Bellwood, col. 4, lines 34-60).

Art Unit: 2142

10. As to claim 11, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the client-formatted response is an HTML document (Bellwood, col. 4, lines 34-60).

11. As to claim 14, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the particular type of client is a mobile phone (Dahm, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 20).

12. As to claim 15, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the method further comprises the steps of receiving data that indicates user-specific customizations to services; storing the data in a configuration database (Dahm, col. 8, lines 21-43);

searching the configuration database for the user-specific customizations in response to receiving the request for the service (Dahm, col. 8, lines 21-43);

the first set of parameters used to generate the request object includes the user-specific customizations (Dahm, col. 7, line 38 - col. 8, line 43).

13. As to claim 16, the one or more data sources include a first web site accessible through a gateway, and a second web site accessible through the gateway (Bellwood, col. 2, lines 35-42; col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 60);

and the step of converting the responses into the particular format includes the gateway converting a first response from the first web site to the particular format; and the gateway converting a second response from the second web site to the particular format (Bellwood, col. 2, lines 35-42; col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 60).

Art Unit: 2142

14. Claims 2-3, 5 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellwood-Dahm as discussed above and further in view of Meltzer et al. (Meltzer), U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391.

15. As to claim 2, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the limitations as discussed above. However, Bellwood-Dahm do not disclose the steps of embedding within the request object one or more filtering criteria, and filtering data from the composite response document based on the filtering criteria. In the same field of endeavor, Meltzer discloses document filters respond to the events generated at the output of a translator according to the element and attribute filters amongst listeners to the XML event generators (col. 27, lines 44-53, col. 82, lines 26-50, and Fig. 11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of filters as taught by Meltzer into the system of Bellwood-Dahm, thereby resulting in the claimed invention, since Meltzer suggests that using filters to receive documents that meet prespecified parameters.

16. As to claim 3, Bellwood-Dahm and Meltzer disclose one of the requests invokes a search mechanism at a data source based on a first set of search criteria (Bellwood, col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 60);

and the step of filtering data includes filtering data that originated from the data source based on a second set of search criteria (Meltzer, col. 27, lines 44-53, col. 82, lines 26-50, and Fig. 11).



17. As to claim 5, Bellwood-Dahm and Meltzer disclose the step of generating the request object includes generating filtering criteria and the method includes filtering data from the composite response document based on the filtering criteria before transforming the composite response document (Meltzer, col. 27, lines 44-53, col. 82, lines 26-50, and Fig. 11).

18. Claims 7, 12, 13, 20, 26, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellwood-Dahm as discussed above and further in view of Call, U.S. Patent No. 6,154,738.

19. As to claim 7, Bellwood-Dahm disclose the limitations as discussed above. However, Bellwood-Dahm do not disclose the step of transforming includes identifying one or more XSL stylesheets based on the second set of parameters and applying one or more XSL stylesheets to the composite response document. In the same field of endeavor, Call discloses that XSL stylesheet processors will enable web browser applications to convert XML data into a form, such as a viewable HTML web page, as specified by the XSL (col. 22, line 55 – col. 24, line 44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use XSL stylesheets to transform XML data as taught by Call into the system for transcoding an input stream to a desired output format using a transcoder

Art Unit: 2142

framework of Bellwood-Dahm, thereby resulting in the claimed invention, since Call suggests that using XSL stylesheets have advantages in presentations.

20. As to claim 12, Bellwood-Dahm and Call disclose the step of generating a request object involves generating an XML request document that includes unresolved links; and the step of transmitting requests involves resolving the unresolved links (Call, col. 24, line 60 – col. 34).

21. As to claim 13, Bellwood-Dahm and Call disclose the step of generating the composite response document involves replacing the unresolved links in the XML request document with XML data generated based on the responses from the one or more data sources (Call, col. 24, line 60 – col. 34).

22. Claims 17-35 are corresponding system and instruction claims containing the similar limitations as the methods described in claims 1-16; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### **Response to Arguments**

23. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(a) Prior art fails to teach

within said system generating, based on a first set of parameters, a request object;

wherein said first set of parameters includes identity of said service;

based on said request object, said system transmitting requests to one or more data sources;

As to point (a), Bellwood teaches the user of the web browser 14 desires to access the data. The browser formulates the request for data including parameters such as name of the server that hosts the data and the path of the URL, and/or a description for the data. Then the request is passed to a first transcoder 22 in a transcoding framework 20 (a system), and the transcoder 22 then expresses the request in HTTP request (request object), e.g., encoding the desired data format into HTTP headers using an HTTP extension mechanism (col. 4, lines 34-60). Bellwood also teaches the transcoder 22 in the system 20 transmits HTTP request to another transcoder 24 and/or transcoder 26 (data resources), which generates data in response to the request (col. 4, line 48 – col. 5, line 13).

(b) Prior art fails to teach

“at said system generating, based on said responses, a composite response document in said particular format”

As to point (b), Bellwood teaches in the transcoding framework 20 (the system), transcoder 24 receives the HTTP request, observes the source type and the desired type, and performs an appropriate translation. The output of the transcoder 24 is provided to a third transcoder 26, which listens for requests in HTTP or some other protocol and generates an appropriate response. The data output from the third transcoder 26 may then be converted into XML (a composite response document) using a transcoder 28 (col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 13).

(c) Prior art fails to teach

“generating a request object within a system that is located separately from the client that requested a service”

As to point (c), Bellwood teaches in a transcoding framework 20 (a system), the transcoder 22 expresses the request in HTTP request (request object), and the system 20 is separately from the client machine 10 that requested a web page hosted on a web server (col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 34).

Art Unit: 2142

24. Applicant's arguments filed on Nov 01, 2000 have been fully considered but they deemed to be persuasive.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The examiner can normally be reached at 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3230.

Art Unit: 2142

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20131

**Or Faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for **formal communications**; please mark  
"EXPEDITE PROCEDURE").

**Or:**


(703) 746-7240 (for **informal or draft communications**, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

**Or:**

(703) 746-7238 (for **After Final Communications**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2142

  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100